



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER 06/924,100	FILING DATE 10/28/86	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT EDWARDS	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. A AF-00732
-----------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

DONALD B. SOUTHDARD  
MOTOROLA, INC.  
1303 ALGONQUIN ROAD  
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER HOFF, M	
ART UNIT 212	PAPER NUMBER 5

DATE MAILED: 04/16/87

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined  Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_  This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s) ~~aaaaa~~ from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2.  Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.  
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 4.  Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152  
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 6.  \_\_\_\_\_

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1.  Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.  
2.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.  
3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.  
4.  Claims 1-17 are rejected.  
5.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.  
6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.  
7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.  
8.  Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.  
9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. These drawings are  acceptable;  
 not acceptable (see explanation).  
10.  The  proposed drawing correction and/or the  proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
has (have) been  approved by the examiner.  Disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).  
11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved.  Disapproved (see explanation). However,  
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are  
corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO  
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.  
12.  Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received  not been received  
 been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in  
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.  
14.  Other

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 5, line 5, "a" should be deleted; page 8, line 26, "19" should be -- 17 --.

Appropriate correction of the disclosure is required.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention. The examiner asserts that the description of voltage regulator 11 is inadequate, because the examiner is unaware of any "conventional" voltage regulator having two outputs of the type recited, that is, one output signal having a frequency several thousand times greater than the other. Applicants' submitted prior Art does not disclose such a device. For applicants to show conventionality, they must show evidence that such a device was known prior to the filing date of the instant application. As submitted, however, the regulator's disclosure is inadequate.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the above objection to the specification.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The use of the word "between" in claim 1 and claim 4 in the instant application is confusing and vague. The preposition "between" implies two objects, i.e., "between" object A and object B. Claim 1, however, recites "between a maximum power source voltage potential" on lines 17-18, and "between a predetermined power source voltage potential" on lines 32-33. Between (said potential) and what?

Claims 2-17 are rejected since they incorporate the language of claim 1.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Marc S. Hoff at telephone number 703-557-7657.

Hoff/sb *Msh*

703-557-7657

4-11-87

*P.R. Salce*

PATRICK R. SALCE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 212